DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 611 HE 005 726

AUTHOR	Counelis, James Steve; Dolan, Frances Anne
TITLE	Perceptions and Needs: The Full Time Undergraduate Commuter Student at the University of San Francisco.
INSTITUTION	San Francisco Univ., Calif. Office of Institutional Studies.
PUB DATE	26 Jul 74
NOTE	27p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*College Students; *Commuting Students; *Higher Education; Questionnaires; Research Projects; School Services; *Student College Relationship; *Student Needs
IDENTIFIERS	*University of San Francisco

ABSTRACT

A three-part questionnaire was designed to assess the needs of the commuter student at the University of San Francisco. The questionnaire, mailed to 250 commuter students, investigated the university student services; desired services, facilities, and activities; and the reason for living off-campus. Results of the survey indicated: (1) Full-time commuter students utilized the bookstore, library, Bursar's Office, University Registrar, and food facilities. (2) The International House, Educational Services Center for Minority Students, the Ombudsman, intramurals, health ministry, and counseling center appeared to be low in usage because of their specialization. (3) Commuter students indicated need for a university bus, student/faculty coffee hours, intramurals, movies, lounge areas, and facilities that would enable them to stay occasionally on campus in the residence overnight. (4) Privacy and lower off-campus living costs appear to reflect the current college trend for students to move off-campus, rather than an indication of an undersirable residence hall system. (MJM)

ED 094611

University of San Francisco
Office of Institutional Studies

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERCEPTIONS AND NEEDS:
THE FULL TIME UNDERGRADUATE COMMUTER
STUDENT AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

by

James Steve Counelis

& Frances Anne Dolan

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 005 726

San Francisco, California 94117

PREFACE

This study is an important one for the university. It provides insight into our full time undergraduate student. It provides a basis for actionable improvement of the university community. And, it provides the first publishable, cooperative study of students done by two university offices, namely, The Office of the Vice President for Student Development, and the Office of Institutional Studies.

I am delighted with these accomplishments, each contributing to the total strength of the university.

Gratefully, I acknowledge Dr. Frances Anne Dolan as colleague and university line officer whose ideas and thrust made this study possible. And I am pleased to note the fine typewriting services of Mrs. Fran Nishiguchi who made the manuscript possible. And to the students who cooperated in providing the information on the questionnaire, the whole university can only say thanks, one that is heartfelt. Of course, the errors rest with this writer, as they should.

JSC

The University of San Francisco
San Francisco, California 94117
July 26, 1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface ii

Text 1

Appendix:

1. Chart No. 1: The University of San Francisco Full Time Non-Resident Undergraduate Student Survey, Fall 1973 17

2. Chart No. 2: The University of San Francisco Full Time Non-Resident Undergraduate Student Survey, Fall 1973: Population and Sample Distributions, by Sex 17

3. Chart No. 3: The University of San Francisco Full Time Non-Resident Undergraduate Student Survey, Fall 1973: Population and Sample Distributions, by Class 18

4. Chart No. 4: The University of San Francisco Full Time Non-Resident Undergraduate Student Survey, Fall 1973: Tests of Significance of Six Demographic Variables 18

5. Chart No. 5: The University of San Francisco Full Time Commuter Student Usage of and Satisfaction with Particular University Offices and Services, Fall 1973 19

6. Chart No. 6: The University of San Francisco Full Time Commuter Students' Modal Pattern of Rating Reasons, Fall 1973 20

7. Survey Documents 21

PERCEPTIONS AND NEEDS: THE FULL TIME UNDERGRADUATE COMMUTER STUDENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

by

James Steve Counelis[+] and Frances Anne Dolan[*]

Framework:

The American college and university inherited the residential college in a bucolic setting from our English brethren. The Cambridge model, though altered, has been with us since the founding of Harvard in 1636. Included in the notion and practice of the residential English college was the total "life adjustment education" for the Englishman of letters, from manners to intellect. The continental European model of the urban college (wherein only educational service is found and outside of which the student fends for himself for housing, food, friendship and entertainment) would not truly arrive on the American scene until the streetcar college of the early twentieth century, though New York University, Cooper's Union, The University of Cincinnati, and St. Ignatius College (The University of San Francisco) among others antedated streetcars.

[+]Dr. James Steve Counelis is Director of the Office of Institutional Studies and Associate Professor of Education in the School of Education in the University of San Francisco, San Francisco, California 94117.

[*]Dr. Frances Anne Dolan is Vice President for Student Development in the University of San Francisco, San Francisco, California 94117.

Founded in 1855, the University of San Francisco has been a commuter college inside "frontier" and later urbane San Francisco for most of its life. The first residence halls were built in 1955, though I am told that in the 1930's, the football team had been provided some housing. And though the full time undergraduate students in residence refer to those full time undergraduates living on-campus, indeed, the bulk of the full time undergraduate students live off-campus, either at home or on their own. In Fall 1973, some 1,031 full time undergraduates resided in on-campus housing, this being 32% of the whole full time undergraduate student body, that total numbering 3,210 students.

But the needs of the commuter students have been recognized rarely because (the argument goes) they come and go from home to school and to work in an endless cycle. The commuter student has his primary orientation toward off-campus loci of living. The commuter student takes care of his own extra curricular needs.

The evening college deans have long recognized the supporting needs of their part time commuter students by minimally providing lounge areas, food services, library and open study facilities. However, the full time commuter students who attend a community college, or a four year (public or private) institution are mysteries. And at the University of San Francisco, they compose over two-thirds of our full time undergraduate population.

This study is belated recognition of the needs and problems of the full time commuter student. I prefer to use the term "commuter student" to the term "non-resident" because it is accurate in description and not negatively value-ladened. Further, this study of

the commuter student is timely, inasmuch as their perceptions and usage of university offices and student services will provide feedback for improvement and adjustment.

The old sentimentality, maudlin perhaps, of "the class of '27" is dead today, as is "Joe College," pom pom girls, flag pole sitting, the "filthy speech" movement, and hopefully, the drug scene in a few years. Loyalty and allegiance to university or college is built upon different interests and ideas, but the same emotions. With "stop-out" students and continuing education merging on all campuses, the distinct four year curriculum and a supporting extra-curriculum are merging out of existence into newer forms. Perhaps, something of value can be learned through this study that will move the University of San Francisco along the road to meaningful educational services for all who seek it here, regardless of their place of residence---on-campus or off-campus.

Methodology:

The questions which structured this study on commuter students are:

(1) Which of the available student offices and services are used by the university's commuting students?

(2) Which of the available student offices and services are not used by the university's commuting students?

(3) From the point of view of the university's commuting students, how satisfactory are these offices and services?

(4) From the point of view of the university's commuting students, why are certain offices and services less used?

(5) From the point of view of the university's commuting

students, why are some office and services satisfactory and other offices and services not?

(6) What student services now unavailable at the university are desired by the University's commuting students?

(7) Why do the university commuting students who do not live at home live off-campus?

Based upon these questions, a two page (one sheet) questionnaire was designed to elicit student response. The questionnaire was also designed to provide anonymous responses, though students desiring the results were encouraged to state their interest. The only demographic data collected were: (1) class: Freshmen, Sophomore, Junior, Senior; (2) sex; (3) number of years at USF; (4) residence: Parents' home or off-campus.

A three-part questionnaire was designed, a copy of which is found in the Appendix. The first part was on university student services. In this part, the student was asked to rate the service and to give the most important reason for that rating. A list of 27 possible reasons was provided for questionnaire coding. A 28th "other" or open blank was provided for student reasons not covered in the list of possible reasons.

The second part of the questionnaire was concerned with desired services, facilities, activities. Seven such items were listed; and three "other" blanks were provided for write-in suggestions.

The third part dealt with reason for living off-campus. Four reasons, plus an open "others" block were provided.

This questionnaire was designed within the Office of the Vice President for Student Development under the guidance of Dr. Frances Anne Dolan, now Vice President for Student Development. The

technical aspects of the questionnaire construction, as well as outside "critique" of the document was performed by the Office of Institutional Studies. The subsequent computerization and preparation of this report has been the responsibility of the Office of Institutional Studies.

A random sample of full time day undergraduate students who lived off-campus was procured from the Student Master File. By a random generator program, using a non-replacement option, a list of 250 student names and addresses was procured and mailing labels produced. A chi-square test was performed to find whether the alphabetical distribution of the randomized sample was statistically the same as that of the population from which it was drawn. Thus, randomness was assured.

This questionnaire was mailed from the Office of Student Development with a cover letter from Dr. Dolan, and a stamped self-addressed envelope included. No follow-up or "tickler" procedure was invoked. See Appendix for a copy of survey documents.

Quantitative Response:

Chart No. 1 provides the detail on the responses. A 41.6% response rate was obtained. This is considered very good, considering the average response rate for mail surveys is about one-third.

[Insert Chart No. 1 here]

Though the original sample statistically was randomized; the response bias is important to note if possible. Two demographic

items provide some indication of that bias, if any.

Chart No. 2 presents a comparison of the frequency and proportional distributions of the population and sample of full time commuter undergraduate students by sex. The sample is biased, apparently, toward feminine responses by 5%. It is also important to note that the overall sex distribution pattern was retained in the response sample of the survey questionnaire, an almost 1% favor toward women.

A way to test the importance of the 5% sex bias is to determine whether the difference in the population and the response sample proportions is significant in a statistical sense. The null hypothesis was tested by calculating the 1% confidence interval for the proportions to see whether a zero was included within the interval. Chart No. 4 indicates that for the sex variable the difference in proportions between the population and sample response was not statistically significant for confidence limits at the one percent level of significance. Hence, the difference of 5% in favor of the women in the sample response is not a statistically significant bias. See Chart Nos. 2 and 3.

[Insert Chart No. 2 here]

Chart No. 3 provides frequency and proportional distributions of both the population and response sample in terms of student class, viz., freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior. Proportionally, the lower division full time commuter students appear under-represented and conversely for the upper division students. Again, to

test the statistical significance of the absolute differences in proportions between the population and the response sample, confidence intervals at the one percent level of significance were calculated. Chart No. 4 presents the results. For all four classes, the apparent absolute differences in proportions are not statistically significant. Hence, the difference in lower and upper division students found between the population and the response sample is not a significant bias.

[Insert Chart Nos. 3 and 4 here]

Empirical Overview:

Having discussed both methodology and representativeness of response, the next step is to form empirical facts that give an important overview to the interpretative section that follows.

The first fact about this survey is that usage of particular offices and services by students is quite independent of their satisfaction derived therefrom. Chart No. 5 presents in ranked order the university offices and services in terms of the commuter students' usage and satisfaction. A Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient (r_s) was calculated on the data in Chart No. 5 to be .05, which is close to zero and randomness as one can document. This independence between student satisfaction and usage is an important background fact to remember in relation to the interpretive section that will follow.

[Insert Chart No. 5 here]

The second fact is found in Chart No. 6. It catalogues the full time commuter students' modal pattern of the purported reasons

for giving their ratings to specific university offices/services. Some 60.7 percent of the university offices and services seem to be outside the ken of these commuter students. These seventeen university offices and services are: (1) academic dean; (2) Accounting and Finance; (3) ASUSF activities; (4) ASUSF offices; (5) the campus ministry; (6) Counseling Center; (7) Educational Services Center for Minority Students; (8) Financial Aid Office; (9) Fog 'n' Grog; (10) Health Services; (11) International House; (12) Intramurals; (13) Ombudsman; (14) Placement; (15) Loyola Lounge; (16) UC Listening Room; (17) UC Pool Room. Though one can reasonably hypothecate testable reasons for this list, I believe that a fuller study of the full time commuter students' life style could provide significant insights, where appropriate university services could be filled in with grace.

In addition, Chart No. 6 indicates that informational and service needs were provided by seven offices and services of the university, which were: (1) academic advising; (2) Bursar's Office; (3) Library; (4) Loyola Lounge; (5) Placement; (6) Public Safety; (7) Registrar. The qualitative character of these desired services, as viewed by our full time commuter students, will be provided later.

In regard to prices, the students noted that both the Bookstore and the Green and Gold Snack Service were too high. And the basketball games were cited as being a good frustration outlet.

In fine, about one third of the list of 26 university offices and services are within the direct usage pattern of our full time commuter students.

[Insert Chart No. 6 here]

Third fact is the rank order of desired services: viz., (1) Room in Residences for occasional overnight stay on campus; (2) commuter lockers; (3) commuter lounge; (4) university bus that would make scheduled runs to and from selected areas of the city to the university; (5) faculty/student coffee hours; (6) morning or earlier intramurals; (7) day time movies. This rank order is based upon mean ratings that range from 2.9 to 5.0 in ranked steps of 1 through 7 (not including the write-in items). Hence, the intensity of "need" for these services is a "lukewarm" mid-ranged one.

The fourth and last fact is concerned with commuter students' ranked reasons for living off-campus. These ranked reasons are: (1) greater privacy and less expensive than Dorm living (tied); (2) must eat in commons if I live on campus; (3) unsatisfactory residence halls; (4) to be closer to work. This rank order is based upon mean ranks assigned by the students in a range of 1 to 5. The mean ranks ranged from 2.2 to 4.4, again, a mid-range of intensiveness of feeling held by full time undergraduate commuter students. These reasons appear to be "lukewarm" in that a very high, or very low, rank is not assigned to any of these reasons by the surveyed group.

With the empirical facts presented above, the following interpretation is presented by Dr. Anne Dolan, who is most closely related and in tune with the meaning of this commuter student survey.

Interpretation of the Survey:

In forming an interpretation of this survey, it is important to know that the students received the survey during the second month of the academic year. Some of the responses were the reflection of one or two contacts with a particular university office or service. Other responses were probably influenced to a greater extent by contacts in past years rather than by the current situation. In terms of the returning students, it is difficult to know if they were reacting to the changes or to previous services received. A case in point would be the personnel and policy changes in Bursar's Office made in the latter part of the 1972-1973 academic year. A further case in point would be student rankings of basketball. Basketball was ranked first in satisfaction. It seems reasonable that this rating was made in terms of the success of last season, in anticipation of success during the current season. Had the responses been sought in late December, after several lost basketball games, the results might well have been quite different.

Part I of this survey, which showed a high percentage of full time commuter students utilized the bookstore, library, Bursar's Office and University Registrar, was predictable because these are necessary services for normal student functioning at the university. It was also predictable that International House, Educational Services Center for Minority Students and the Ombudsman would be low in usage because these are specialized offices and services for a relatively small number of students. Also, the high utilization of facilities for food, drinks and relaxation was not unexpected. But the low utilization of Intramurals, Health Service, Campus Ministry and the Counseling Center was

not expected. The evidence of this survey supports the theory that full time commuter students utilize those offices and services which directly contribute to their academic pursuits, being highly selective and limiting their participation to those aspects of the extra-curriculum indirectly related to their academic progress. A study of the full time commuter students' life style would provide a more adequate test of this theory. See Chart No. 5.

The ranking of university offices and services for satisfaction by our full time undergraduate commuter students was not predictable. It is a truism that satisfaction is related to fulfilled needs and to the manner in which they were filled. And this applies to our student clients here.

Those offices and services, which met the needs of students in what was seen as an impersonal manner, or where the staff was enforcing what seemed to the students to be inflexible policies, were ranked low in satisfaction. These included the Bursar's Office and the University Registrar, which were among the most used services. On the other hand, those offices and services which met the needs of our full time undergraduate commuter students in a friendly and understanding way were ranked high in satisfaction. The library was the only facility that was highly utilized and highly satisfactory from the viewpoint of the survey respondents. The Placement Office, Academic Deans, Educational Services Center for Minority Students, basketball games, UC listening room, UC Pool Room and Fog 'n' Grog were ranked high in satisfaction, but were used by the students less frequently. Within this detailed reading, the empirical fact that student usage and student satisfaction were not related takes on new meaning. See Chart No. 5.

The second part of the survey was concerned with ranking certain desired services or facilities. The full time commuter students indicated they would like to stay occasionally on campus in the residences overnight. This service would make it possible for more commuter students to participate in certain on-campus evening activities and to use the library late in the evening. Also, the commuter students indicated their interest in lockers, a former service that could be reinstituted.

As indicated above, the desire for a commuter lounge was rated third. This raises the question: "What kind of lounge is desired?" "Where?" Two lounge areas---Campion Lounge and Loyola Lounge---were among the top ten items on the survey in terms of usage. Neither of these lounges is reserved solely for use of full time undergraduate commuter students. In fact, they are used by everyone, viz., students, staff and faculty. An inquiry into this matter is called for.

The interests of the commuter students in a university bus, student/faculty coffee hours, intramurals and movies during the day time seem to be reflective of their "needs" while on campus. The scheduling of some of these activities, specifically pegged to the commuter student life style, would enable their better integration into the life of this university community.

Commuter students in full time programs have reasons for not living on campus. The primary reasons are privacy and a need to reduce living expenses. These are two rather forceful reasons.

The fact that room and board contracts are combined for resi-

dent students at the University of San Francisco was another reason for living off-campus. Among the deterrences to living on-campus could be working hours conflicting with commons meal hours. Certainly, dissatisfaction with residence facilities and proximity to work enter into the equation.

The very high ranks given to privacy and lower off-campus living costs appear to reflect the current college trend for students to move off-campus, rather than a necessary indication of an undesirable residence hall system. In recent months, however, much has been done to increase the appeal of the residences. Floor lounges have been redecorated and furnished, corridors have been carpeted, a few suites have been instituted, and all corridors are scheduled for redecoration.

Feedback for Action:

There is something of value in this brief study of the University of San Francisco's full time undergraduate commuter student. All seven of the questions which were posed at the beginning of the paper have been answered, and with fairness. But, that which is of value in this brief study rests in the university's opportunity to respond creatively to the information provided to us by our commuter study. Dr. Dolan has summarized well the following ten actionable suggestions. These suggestions are important for the student feedback needs to be used to improve our university community through its quality of life.

(1) Offices, services, and activities included in this survey which were ranked low in student satisfaction should

examine their personnel functions to determine how aware the members of their staffs are of the importance of a friendly, understanding, personal approach to each and every person whom they serve.

(2) Office and services which enforce University policies affecting students should examine these policies to determine whether student needs are considered as important as University convenience in policy formulation and enforcement.

(3) Offices and activities which provide services intended to enrich the students' college life, to assist students in making better choices, or to help the students prepare for a more effective post-college career might well examine their present approaches to students in an effort to become more action-oriented in bringing their services to the attention of the University community and particularly, to the non-resident students.

(4) Student organizations and activities might do well to check their programs and activities to determine what changes might be made to encourage participation by more non-resident students.

(5) The Non-Residents Council chairman and/or ASUSF should investigate the possibility of providing rooms on campus for the occasional use of non-resident students, of making lockers available for the non-residents, and the feasibility of instituting faculty/student coffee hours.

(6) The Non-Resident Council Chairman should inquire into just what kind of lounge facilities are desired by the non-resident students.

(7) Further consideration might be given to the feasibility of providing a University bus, in order to improve transportation to and from campus for the non-resident students.

(8) Additional efforts might be made by the Office of Residence Life to increase the opportunities for privacy in the residences.

(9) The effects of optional board contracts should be investigated again.

(10) ASUSF Officers might re-examine the functions of student government in an attempt to be more responsive to student needs and generally more effective.

An Addendum:

An action-orientation is one of the thrusts of this report on campus. To this, however, is appended the obvious need to make a

study of the full time (and, perhaps, part time) undergraduate (and, perhaps, graduate) commuter students' life style. The purpose of this study is to know something about their work/study/play pattern so that more effective programming of the university curriculum and the university extra-curriculum could make the university an open and viable community with the appropriate flexibility to meet our students' needs. Such a study could, in fact, add more "science" to American higher education literature in an area that is very sparse and needs work. Both of these purposes are attainable. Hopefully, the need for such a study will be felt to be a necessity within the university.

APPENDIX

CHART NO. 1: THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO FULL TIME NON-RESIDENT UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT SURVEY, FALL 1973

QUESTIONNAIRE ACCOUNTING	RESPONSE	
	N	%
1. The number of questionnaires mailed.	250	100.0
2. The number of questionnaires returned by the U.S. Post Office as not deliverable.	6	2.4
3. The total number of questionnaires received.	106	42.4
4. The total number of usable questionnaires in this study.	104	41.6

University of San Francisco Office of Institutional Studies 7/74

CHART NO. 2: THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO FULL TIME NON-RESIDENT UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT SURVEY, FALL 1973: POPULATION AND SAMPLE DISTRIBUTIONS, BY SEX

SEX	POPULATION		RESPONSE SAMPLE	
	N	%	N	%
Male	1,601	49.9	46	44.2
Female	1,609	50.1	58	55.8
TOTAL	3,201	100.0	104	100.0

University of San Francisco Office of Institutional Studies 7/74

CHART NO. 3: THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO FULL TIME NON-RESIDENT UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT SURVEY, FALL 1973: POPULATION AND SAMPLE DISTRIBUTIONS, BY CLASS

CLASS	POPULATION		RESPONSE SAMPLE	
	N	%	N	%
Freshmen	729	22.7	20	19.2
Sophomores	756	23.6	17	16.3
Juniors	709	22.1	29	28.0
Seniors	1,016	31.6	38	35.5
TOTAL	3,210	100.0	104	100.0

University of San Francisco Office of Institutional Studies 7/74

CHART NO. 4: THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO FULL TIME NON-RESIDENT UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT SURVEY, FALL 1973: TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE OF SIX DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

POPULATION TO RESPONSE SAMPLE PROPORTION DIFFERENCES: VARIABLES	1% CONFIDENCE INTERVALS	NULL HYPOTHESIS DECISION
1. Sex: Males	$-.13 < P_1 - P_2 < .25$	Retained
2. Sex: Females	$-.23 < P_1 - P_2 < .19$	Retained
3. Freshmen	$-.19 < P_1 - P_2 < .26$	Retained
4. Sophomores	$-.16 < P_1 - P_2 < .31$	Retained
5. Juniors	$-.28 < P_1 - P_2 < .16$	Retained
6. Seniors	$-.24 < P_1 - P_2 < .16$	Retained

University of San Francisco Office of Institutional Studies 7/74

CHART NO. 5: THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO FULL TIME COMMUTER STUDENT USAGE OF AND SATISFACTION WITH PARTICULAR UNIVERSITY OFFICES AND SERVICES, FALL 1973

OFFICES/SERVICES	USAGE		SATISFACTION	
	%	RANK	MEAN SATISFACTION RATING	RANK
1. Bookstore	100.0	1.0	3.0	16.5
2. Library	98.0	2.0	3.8	2.0
3. Bursar's Office	92.0	3.0	2.4	26.0
4. Registrar's Office	91.0	4.0	2.7	24.5
5. Campion Lounge	88.0	5.0	2.9	20.0
6. Green/Gold Snack	87.0	6.0	3.0	16.5
7. Loyola Lounge	79.0	7.5	3.3	10.0
8. Academic Advising	79.0	7.5	2.9	20.0
9. Public Safety	66.0	9.0	3.2	13.0
10. Basketball Games	61.0	10.5	4.2	1.0
11. Placement Office	61.0	10.5	3.5	6.0
12. Financial Aid Office	60.0	12.0	3.1	15.0
13. ASUSF Activities	59.0	13.0	2.9	20.0
14. Academic Dean	55.0	14.0	3.6	4.0
15. UC Listening Room	47.0	15.0	3.5	6.0
16. UC Pool Room	42.0	16.5	3.7	3.0
17. ASUSF Offices	42.0	16.5	2.8	23.0
18. Health Service	41.0	18.5	2.9	20.0
19. Accounting/Finance	41.0	18.5	2.7	24.5
20. Campus Ministry	39.0	20.0	3.3	10.0
21. Intramurals	36.0	21.0	3.3	10.0
22. Fog 'n Grog	33.0	22.0	3.5	6.0
23. Counseling Center	28.0	23.0	3.2	13.0
24. International House	22.0	24.0	3.2	13.0
25. ESCMS	14.0	25.0	3.4	8.0
26. Ombudsman	9.0	26.0	2.9	20.0

CHART NO. 6: THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO FULL TIME COMMUTER STUDENTS' MODAL PATTERN OF RATING REASONS, FALL 1973

MODAL PATTERN TO STUDENTS' RATING REASONS	UNIVERSITY OFFICES/SERVICES	
	N	%
1. Reason No. 8:		
I do not know enough about it.	17	60.7
2. Reason No. 10:		
I was provided the information/service I needed.	8	28.6
3. Reason No. 7:		
I think the prices are too high.	2	7.1
4. Reason No. 13:		
This is a good outlet for my frustrations.	1	3.6
TOTAL	28*	100.0

*Two tied items included twice, viz., Loyola Lounge and Placement Office which scored Reasons 8 and 10.

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT
FOR STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

October 12, 1973

Do the various service offices and facilities of the University meet the needs of our non-resident students? As a non-resident student, we need your response to the enclosed survey to help us answer that question. Please take the few minutes necessary to complete the survey and return it in the enclosed stamped self-addressed envelope no later than October 22, 1973.

The survey is limited to both sides of one sheet of paper. The second sheet contains a list from which you are asked to select the numbers which correspond to your responses in Part I, Column 2.

Since this survey is being sent only to a selected sample of non-resident students, it is most important that all who receive it complete it and return it if the results are to be really helpful in determining how well we are meeting your needs and the needs of your fellow non-resident students. You need not identify your response; however, if you would like to receive a copy of the results, please check the statement at the end of the survey and enclose your name and address on a separate piece of paper.

Your cooperation in this survey will be greatly appreciated and hopefully will be directly beneficial to you personally through improved programs and services.

Sincerely,

Anne Dolan
Associate Vice President
for Student Development

AD/wg
ENC.

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
NON-RESIDENT SURVEY

Office Code (1:01-03)

GENERAL INFORMATION — Check Appropriate Responses

Class: (1:04)	Sex: (1:05)		Residence: (1:07)
___ 1. Freshman ___ 2. Sophomore ___ 3. Junior ___ 4. Senior	___ 1. Male ___ 2. Female	Number of Years at USF: _____ (1:06)	___ 1. Parent's Home ___ 2. Off Campus

I UNIVERSITY STUDENT SERVICES

DIRECTIONS: Column 1 - For each item listed below write in Column 1 the rating scale number which represents the degree of satisfaction you have experienced in using the office, service or facility. If you have not used certain offices, services or facilities enough to rate them, mark those items with an X - not enough information.

Column 2 - Using the attached list of reasons for rating offices, services or facilities, indicate the code number of the most important reason for your rating.

Rating Scale

5	4	3	2	1	X
Highly Satisfactory		Satisfactory		Not Satisfactory	Not Enough Information

	Column 1 RATING			Column 2 Most Important Reason for your Rating (Use Attached List)	
(1:08)	_____	1.	Academic Advising	_____	(1:09-10)
(1:11)	_____	2.	Academic Dean	_____	(1:12-13)
(1:14)	_____	3.	Accounting & Finance	_____	(1:15-16)
(1:17)	_____	4.	ASUSF Activities	_____	(1:18-19)
(1:20)	_____	5.	ASUSF Offices	_____	(1:21-22)
(1:23)	_____	6.	Basketball Games	_____	(1:24-25)
(1:26)	_____	7.	Bookstore	_____	(1:27-28)
(1:29)	_____	8.	Bursar's Office	_____	(1:30-31)
(1:32)	_____	9.	Campion Lounge	_____	(1:33-34)
(1:35)	_____	10.	Campus Ministry	_____	(1:36-37)
(1:38)	_____	11.	Counseling Center	_____	(1:39-40)
(1:41)	_____	12.	Educational Services Center for Minority Students	_____	(1:42-43)
(1:44)	_____	13.	Financial Aid Office	_____	(1:45-46)
(1:47)	_____	14.	Fog 'n Grog	_____	(1:48-49)
(1:50)	_____	15.	Green & Gold Snack Bar	_____	(1:51-52)
(1:53)	_____	16.	Health Service	_____	(1:54-55)
(1:56)	_____	17.	International House	_____	(1:57-58)
(1:59)	_____	18.	Intramurals	_____	(1:60-61)
(1:62)	_____	19.	Library	_____	(1:63-64)
(1:65)	_____	20.	Loyola Lounge	_____	(1:66-67)
(1:68)	_____	21.	Ombudsman	_____	(1:69-70)
(1:71)	_____	22.	Placement Office	_____	(1:72-73)
(1:74)	_____	23.	Public Safety	_____	(1:75-76)
(1:77)	_____	24.	Registrar's Office	_____	(2:04-05)
(2.06)	_____	25.	UC Listening Room	_____	(2.07-08)
(2:09)	_____	26.	UC Pool Room	_____	(2:10-11)

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
NON-RESIDENT SURVEY

II DESIRED SERVICES, FACILITIES, ACTIVITIES

DIRECTIONS: Rank in order of preference (1 = highest rank order) those services/facilities/activities listed below which you think should be available for non-resident students.

_____ 1. Commuter Lounge (2:12-13)

_____ 2. Commuter Lockers (2:14-15)

_____ 3. Room in Residences for occasional overnight stay on campus (2:16-17)

_____ 4. Daytime Movies (2:18-19)

_____ 5. Morning or early afternoon intramurals (2:20-21)

_____ 6. University bus that would make scheduled runs to and from selected areas of the city to the University (2:22-23)

_____ 7. Faculty/student coffee hours (2:24-25)

_____ 8. Other (please specify) _____ (2:26-27)

_____ 9. Other (please specify) _____ (2:28-29)

_____ 10. Other (please specify) _____ (2:30-31)

III REASONS FOR LIVING OFF CAMPUS

DIRECTIONS: FOR STUDENTS NOT LIVING IN PARENTS' HOME BUT RESIDING OFF-CAMPUS rank in order of importance (1 = most important) your reasons for living off campus based on the items listed below.

_____ 1. To be closer to my job (2:32)

_____ 2. Greater privacy than dorm living (2:33)

_____ 3. Less Expensive than University room and board (2:34)

_____ 4. The University has unsatisfactory residence halls (2:35)

_____ 5. Must eat in Commons if I live on campus (2.36)

_____ 6. Other (please specify) _____ (2:37)

Please send a copy of the results of this survey to me ☐

PLEASE RETURN BY OCTOBER 22, 1973

LIST OF POSSIBLE REASONS FOR RATING OFFICES, SERVICES OR FACILITIES TO BE USED IN PART I COLUMN 2

1. My commuting time does not allow time to participate.
2. My job responsibilities do not allow time to participate.

3. I am not interested in student government.
4. I have too many social commitments off campus.

5. I have too many family commitments.
6. I know what courses I need without advice.

7. I think the prices are too high.
8. I do not know enough about it.

9. I have found the staff friendly and understanding.
10. I was provided the information/service I needed.

11. I did not know this office/facility was available.
12. No one would listen to me.

13. This is a good outlet for my frustrations.
14. I feel the staff does not understand needs of non-resident students.

15. I felt this was for resident students only.
16. I feel the policies are not flexible enough.

17. I believe student government is ineffective and irrelevant.
18. I feel uncomfortable going there.

19. I believe non-resident students are not really given opportunities to participate.
20. I know people who work there.

21. I needed help and did not get it.
22. Not open when I have time to use it.

23. I know people who were helped there.
24. I do not have friends to go with.

25. I do not have transportation.
26. I was treated as an object rather than a person.

27. I am not able to get to campus in the evening.

28. Other (please specify) _____